

Remarks

Claims 1-11, 16, 17, 19, 21-32, 34-37, 44-53, 55-76 and 85-88 are pending in the application.

Claim 55 has been canceled.

Claims 1, 24, 29, 34, 44, 48, 50-51, 53, 55-58, 61-63, 73-74 and 85-88 have been amended to clarify that the plurality of stiffener components are attached to a substrate, and that the substrate and stiffener components are separate components that are attached and secured together.

For example, Claim 85 (as amended) defines a semiconductor device as follows (emphasis added):

85. A semiconductor device comprising: a plurality of molded plastic stiffeners attached to a substrate without an adhesive element, wherein the substrate and the stiffeners are separate components that are attached and secured together.

Claim 44 (as amended) defines a method of securing a stiffener to a substrate, as follows (emphasis added):

44. A method of securing a stiffener to a substrate, comprising:
 applying a stiffener material onto a substrate to form a plurality of stiffeners proximate a periphery of the substrate; and
 hardening the stiffener material wherein the plurality of stiffeners are attached to the substrate without an adhesive element, and the substrate and the stiffener components are separate components that are attached and secured together.

Support for the amendments is in the published application US 2003/0155636 at paragraph [0040] ("*...with molded stiffener 26 attached thereto...*") and paragraph [0051] ("*...provide one component (i.e., molded stiffener or lead frame) with dimensions that correspond to the dimensions of the other component...*").

No new matter has been added with the amendments to the claims, which are made merely clarify language used in the claims and/or the subject matter claimed. The scope of the claims is intended to be the same as before the amendment.

Rejection of Claims under 35 USC § 102(e)/103(a) (Mitchell)

The Examiner maintains the rejection of Claims 1 and 85 under Section 102(e) as anticipated by USP 6,602,740 (Mitchell), and Claims 3-8 as obvious under Section 103(a) over Mitchell. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In the final Office Action mailed April 27, 2007, the Examiner stated as follows (Page 8; emphasis added):

...Applicant's further allege that the claims of the present invention do not recite "integrally molded" which is what Mitchell teaches. The examiner acknowledges that the claims at the present do not explicitly state the stiffeners being integrally molded. However, the molded stiffeners of Mitchell can not be excluded *because the stiffeners are integrally molded*...

The claims have been amended to further define the features of the claimed embodiments of Applicant's devices and methods.

The Examiner cited to element 142 (dam) in Fig. 5 of Mitchell.




FIG. 5

It is well established that, to constitute anticipation under Section 102, each and every element of a claimed invention must be found in a single reference. *Hybridism Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 231 USPQ 81 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Dalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 771, 218 USPQ 781, 789 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 104 S.Ct. 1284, 224 USPQ 520 (1984); *In re Marshall*, 578 F.2d 301, 198 USPQ 344 (CCPA 1978).

Moreover, it is incumbent upon the Examiner to identify where each and every facet of the claimed invention is disclosed in the applied reference. *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist and Derrick*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

The Examiner's Section 102 anticipation rejection is not consistent with this rule.

Mitchell teaches a single element – dam 142.

Mitchell does not describe a plurality of stiffener components as required by the claims. Nor is there any suggestion in Mitchell of a plurality of stiffener components.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC § 103(a)

The Examiner maintained the obviousness rejections of the claims as follows:

- Claims 2-8, 11, 37 and 85 over Mitchell in view of USP 6,020,221 (Lim);
- Claims 9-11, 16-17, 23-24, 28, 34-35, 44-46, 48-49, 55-58, 60, and 62-76 over Mitchell in view of "Admitted Prior Art" (APA), citing to Applicant's Figures 1-2 and the specification at pages 1-2; and
- Claim 47 over Mitchell in view of APA, further in view of USP 6,517,662 (Culnane), citing to Culnane at col. 6, lines 34-50 and Figure 1.

For the reasons stated above with regard to Mitchell's failure to teach or suggest the recited elements of the claims, the proposed modification of Mitchell's device with Lim's materials or with either the APA or Culnane's disclosure would not result in Applicant's devices as claimed.


Mitchell does not describe or suggest a plurality of stiffener components as required by the claims.

Mitchell, either alone or combined with the secondary references, does not teach or suggest Applicant's devices as claimed. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Extension of Term. The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 CFR § 1.136 apply. Applicant believes that a one-month extension of term is required. Please charge the required fee (large entity) to Account No. 23-2053. If an additional extension is required, please consider this a petition therefor, and charge the required fee to Account No. 23-2053.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Kristine M. Strodthoff, Reg. No. 34,259

Dated: August 27, 2007

WHYTE HIRSCHBOECK DUDEK S.C.
555 East Wells Street, Suite 1900
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-3819
(414) 273-2100
Customer No. 31870